1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

Last Star was not sure what spirit was the subject
643 of a chief's dreams, but presumed it must have been the mocking
781 bird, because anyone who desired to become an orator dreamed
825 of this bird.

His successor was his son or other close relative in the patrilineal line. The rule was not absolute but dependent on the competence or willingness of the logical successor. Normally the inheritor was a son (not of necessity the eldest son) because it was assumed that "the son had been instructed by his father, but they would pass over an incompetent son for a close relative on the father's side." The successor's competence was taken as a sign that he, in his turn, had had the requisite dreams. In default of a qualified son, the dead chief's brother or brother's son was chosen. The transmission was through the chief's sister only if she had sons while his brother had none. No woman could inherit the position. In the case cited below, the succession was to a filial grandson because the daughter could not hold office.

173 The first Maricopa chief who could be recalled by Kutox was
643 killed by the Mohave at Sacate. "He had wanted his sister's sons [*sic*] to be chief in his place, but they [the sons or the people?] refused." Then the people chose his eldest son, but he too refused; the chieftaincy going to his second son Xan,igwacxa'm[4], "frog beater." The latter was killed in battle in Yuma territory before Kutox was born (1847). He had a sister who had no son but a daughter. The son of this daughter was chosen chief. This man was Charlie Redbird's father. Charlie would now be chief if they had one. Last Star knew nothing of earlier chiefs, but thought the transmission was from an unnamed chief[3] through his daughter to Charlie Redbird's father. He is probably correct, but in
613 either case the principle is the same; that transmission was always through the paternal lineage though not of necessity through males. It is obvious that the chieftaincy did not remain in a single sib.[3]

769 [3] Here occurred an instance of the emphatic refusal to name the dead, perhaps because Last Star was talking of his wife's ancestors (his wife being Charlie Redbird's sister) in the presence of Charlie's wife.

[3] The Mohave cited to Kroeber (*Handbook*, p. 801) the name of the Maricopa chief at the time of the Kohuana adhesion (1838) as Aha-kurrauva, and about

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa
Kohuana

dren: nevertheless, they would never think of using parent-child terms for one another. They would be horrified by the reference to the dead. Adoption of children was frequent because of the wars. Even distant relatives would take them. When the child was adult, he would look on his foster-parents as he would on true parents. They have a saying: "never abuse a child, because the day will come when you too will be [as] a child." Yet occasionally orphans and step-children were mistreated. Despite this sentiment, there was a curious detachment toward children. No one would wholly blame a woman for deserting her children if her husband had given her sufficient cause.

An illustrative incident dates from about 1840. There was a Kohuana woman of the Kohuana village at Gila Crossing whose husband had died. She had two little children, a boy of six and a girl of two. She decided that she wanted to live with her relatives still on the Colorado. She thought the little children could never travel that far afoot. So she prepared provisions for herself, sent the children off to play, merely telling them to wait for her, and stole off to join the group that was going. When she failed to return, the boy led his little sister by the hand from house to house, inquiring for her. At night he would take her into the meeting house and build a fire to keep warm. In the morning they would go to someone's house to be fed. They had no relatives there. The boy said, "If I have no relatives here, I will call you all ciyi',[61] strangers." The two were inseparable. People took care of them. When they were grown, he said, "I have taken the trouble to bring up my sister; now someone should take the trouble to marry her." Both have long been dead.

A brother and sister had the highest respect for each other; they would not use obscene words in the other's presence, for example. Yet I received the impression that this had none of the stringency of Crow custom,[62] but was rather our own middle-class attitude.

Relationship seems to have imposed an obligation to be at least friendly and helpful if needed. Today, relatives gather to till each other's fields, expecting no more than to be fed by their host, or they tend each other's children.

Something of this sentiment is reflected in the following tale. In the early days an American beaver hunter living west of the Gila Bend Mountains was friendly with the Maricopa. He had bags of dried beaver skins there. Some

[61] The use of this form (ciyi' instead of kiyi') indicates that he must have been addressing the women.

[62] Lowie, *Social Life of the Crow*, p. 214.

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1933) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa
Haldidhoma
Yuma
Mohave

768 moved to a new locality, where a new house was built. This
[166] habit seems to have led to a constantly shifting occupation of the Gila valley, much accelerated by the epidemics incident to the coming of the whites.

765 The relatives would mourn for four days following the death. At the end of the fourth day, they were always visited by an older person who talked to them, admonishing them not to think of their dead relative for fear they might also sicken. He tried to get them to efface it from their minds. For this reason, there was no mourning ceremony, according to my Halchidhoma informant; but he later described the very full rite given below. After four days they resumed their normal occupations.

765 Purification (matarāč'k) was necessary for the mourning rel-
783 atives, the speech-maker, and everyone else who had touched or tended the corpse. They threw all the clothing they wore into the pyre and went to bathe. (In fact, everyone who was present threw at least one article into it before leaving the spot.) On reaching home, before going to bed, they built a little fire on which arrowweeds were lain to smoke themselves. For four days
[262] they abstained from meat and salt, bathing each morning. Mourning relatives singed their hair short, not close.[1] The length
[587] of mourning was not fixed: some widows and widowers remarried within a few months, but it was usual to wait a year or two.

I several times observed an old woman walking alone wailing or rather groaning for relatives who had died some time before. But when she reached the house of her niece, where I was, she left off abruptly. I was told that she grieved all the time and that she dreamed of the dead.

551 The objection to naming the dead was very strong, so much so
769 that it was very difficult to obtain genealogical material. This was not an absolute tabu but a strong repugnance. As elsewhere among Indians, mentioning a man's dead relatives (called nĭctcĭm'g) was comparable to cursing him. Kutox, commenting on this, said, "But every time I hurt myself I say, 'I have no grandmother; I have no grandfather.' Soon I will be with my dead relatives so I do not mind speaking of them."

[184] [1] Purification of mourners by bathing and smoking also occurred among the Yuma (Gifford, *Yuma Dreams*, p. 66) and the Mohave purified themselves by smoke in the scalp dance (Kroeber, *Handbook*, p. 752).